CHAPTER 1

1.1 AIM, PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

This thesis attempts to reconstruct the manner and the effects of the forced removal of the Ravele community, from their historical homes in old Mauluma\(^1\) along the Luvuvhu River Valley. Luvuvhu is the name given to a river that dominates the area under discussion. The name Luvuvhu’ is retained until, it enters Kruger National Park, where the Vatsongas call it Phafuri - as the river flows through Chief Mphaphuli’s territory. After relocation, the whole area under discussion is now known as Levubu. Levubu is corruption of the word Luvuvhu by the local white farming community.

Old Mauluma in the Luvuvhu valley was situated on the North Eastern part of Louis Trichardt. More or less 3000 Ravele community members were forcibly removed from their land, between 1920 and 1940 to new Mauluma or Beaconsfields.\(^2\) The removal constituted a severe crisis for the members of the community as they were taken from a rich ecological area and resettled 100 kilometres west of old Mauluma, a dry and rocky area.

A study of the Ravele community’s removal from old Mauluma (Levubu area) is especially pertinent at this juncture because of the campaign by the previous owners to reclaim their land. Since the April 1994 election and the promise by the government that dispossessed people could reclaim their land, hundreds of the former Levubu residents (including Ravele community) have demanded compensation or return to their land.

Not surprisingly, the campaign has the support of all those who were removed, but is viewed with suspicion by white farmers in Levubu and surrounding areas. Whether the Ravele community will succeed in their campaign or not is uncertain. However the campaign has highlighted the anger of people who were forcibly removed from their homes. Many of these people believe, naively perhaps, that the wrongs of the past will only be eradicated when they can escape the enforced racial segregation of the past and return to their old location where the Vhavenda and the Vatsonga lived together.
This study aims to investigate the forced removal of the Ravele community, from 1920-1940. Specific attention will be given to why forced removal was implemented, the methods used to enforce the government’s policies on the Ravele community and its consequences on the community. Their history will be investigated before and after the 1920’s, when the area was cleared to pave the way for an irrigation scheme and occupation of the land by white settlers.

The effects on aspects of their lives like, their culture and their farming will also be highlighted.

This study also aims to examine the government’s strategies, such as forced removal, as a result of the introduction of irrigation schemes at Middleburg, introduction of a Game Reserve in the Makuleke area and the resettlement of the Ravele community. The effects of white settlers, with specific reference to the Ravele community, will also be highlighted. Implementation methods used by the government to ensure the success of their policies, the pressure from missionaries who were seriously concerned about the white settlers problem, all will be integrated into the study.

Lastly the focus will shift to assessing the effects of forced removal on the Ravele community and what can be done to remedy this. This study may assist the government to make judgement on compensation, land redistribution and land reforms in the Northern Province.

1.2 PROBLEM FORMULATION

The following questions will inform the study :
- Who are the Ravele people/community?
- Why and how did racial policies play a role in the removal of the Ravele community?
- Why was it necessary for the South African government to provide land for the white settlers?
- What were the incentives for the removal?
- Which Acts were passed to implement the forced removal of the Ravele community?
- What were the methods used by the government to implement their policy of forced removal?
- What role was played by the missionaries in the removal?
- What were the incentives for those who co-operated in the removal?
- What were the conditions and experiences of the Ravele community before and after their removal?

1.3 HISTORIOGRAPHICAL/BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DISCUSSION

A variety of works have been written on forced removal in South Africa (especially other parts of the country, besides Northern Transvaal).

We have general works, where forced removal is a sub-theme. For example works by C. Bundy: The Rise and Fall of South African Peasantry; N. Worden : The Making of Modern South Africa: Conquest, Segregation and Apartheid, W. Beinart and S. Dubow : Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth - Century South Africa, 1850-1930. However, little was written about the Far Northern Transvaal. Only L. Platsky and C. Walker : The Surplus people and C. Saunders: Reader’s Digest Illustrated History of South Africa : The Real Story, made brief references to this area.

There are also more specific works on the historiography of forced removal. M. Nash : Black Uprooting from White South Africa; E. Unterhalter : Forced removals: The division, Segregation and Control of People in South Africa, T. Nemutanzhela: Ploughing amongst the Stones : The story of Betterment in the Zoutpansberg, 1939-44, A. Baldwin : Uprooting a Nation: the study of three million evictions in South Africa, C. Desmond : The Discarded People : An Account of African Resettlement in South Africa. Through their view point, one may argue that forced removal, was one of the policies pursued to maintain white supremacy over blacks, however such policies have now changed over decades, because of political power shifts and different ideologies.

R. Morrell approached forced removal economically. In Morrell’s article, “African Land Purchase and Native Land Act in the Eastern Transvaal and Competition and Cooperation in Middleburg, 1900-1930” in Beinart, P. Delius, S. Trapido, eds., Putting a Plough to the Ground Accumulation and Dispossession in Rural South Africa, 1850-1930, the poor white problem was described as another
cause of rural black land dispossession. According to Morrell irrigation schemes were introduced in places such as Middleburg to empower poor whites economically.3

M. Legassick, in “Legislation, Ideology and Economy in post - 1948 South Africa” and D. O’Meara, Volksapitalisme, both showed the economic effects of resettlement in rural areas. They supported the views which emphasised that segregation and apartheid were dysfunctional to capitalism. They argued that forced removal was an attempt by the state to address the contradictions and crisis faced by a rapidly industrialising society. They also focused on a broader socio-economic and political process after World War II. These contributions had a significant influence on subsequent writers.4

There are a number of sources emphasising the consequences of forced removals. According to these sources, blacks were deprived of their farming skills, because they no longer had land for farming. The most prominent of these sources are C. Van Onselen: The Seed is Mine. The life of Kas Maine, A South African Sharecropper 1894-1985, T. Keegan, et al: Rural Politics: Forced Removal in South Africa, T. Keegan: Facing the Storm: Portraits of Black lives in Rural South Africa. These sources show the reason for and impact of forced removal on both labour tenants and poor white farmers. A.J. Jevees and J. Crush in White farms, Black Labour: The State and Agrarian Change in Southern Africa, 1910-50, added that, forced removal was a labour mobilising strategy designed to make more agricultural workers available for white farmers.

People resisted forced removal, not necessarily because it was organised by main national political movements. For example, N. Worden: The Making of Modern South Africa, segregation and apartheid, argued that, these struggles by different communities against removal, played a decisive role in the rise and the fall of segregation and apartheid.5

Geographers and town planners contributed significantly to our understanding of the making of apartheid towns and cities. A.J. Christopher in The Atlas of Apartheid, traced the development of the segregated cities and towns back to colonial times. Christopher pointed out that many of the ideas used by twentieth century urban planners had their origins in the colonial times. Interestingly, it is argued that the twin process of removal and resettlement took many years to be implemented. However, Christopher
did not analyse the underlying reasons for this long delay.\textsuperscript{6}

L. Vail: *Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa*, attempts to locate forced removal within the context of rural planning. Vail wanted to show that procedures developed under removal Acts were derived from established planning practices from pre 1948 era. This enticed planners into what they believed were comprehensive racial segregation\textsuperscript{7}

The works of B. Bozzoli in *Class, Community and Conflict; South African Perspective*, showed the necessity for research on local communities, to discuss in detail the way in which specific segregation and apartheid laws were implemented concerning removals. The above-mentioned study showed that one cannot talk of a uniform implementation of the forced removals.\textsuperscript{8}

This discussion is general, because very little work has been written on the Ravele community in “Luvuvhu”, but more can still be written about this farming area. Hugh Stayt wrote about the history of Vhavenda as a whole. Although he concentrated on “exoticism”, his work gave a brief history of the fertility of land around “Luvuvhu”. His book is useful because it portrayed Venda culture before its disintegration from contact with Europeans. However, it failed to recognise that the main cause of such disintegration was land alienation by whites.\textsuperscript{9}

In 1988, Victor Mphadzha finished an honours thesis on “the effects of the relocation of the Vhavenda from Luvuvhu”. His work dealt with the hardship that people experienced during the actual process of resettlement and the lack of facilities immediately after removals. He did not concentrate on the long-term effects. Though the work consulted extensive oral sources, it lacked strong analytical and theorical approaches.\textsuperscript{10}

Carol Conerly also finished an honours thesis in 1990 on the “Surrendering of lands in Northern Transvaal.” Her work dealt with land dispossession of Vhavenda until 1926, but she did not concentrate on the Luvuvhu situation, however, her work is relevant to this study as she also dealt with the lands of Mphephu, which include Luvuvhu. She has argued how private land ownership by whites as
opposed to traditional communal ownership by Vhavenda, led to land conflict.11

The point of departure for this study is that it places more emphasis on the history as shaped by real life experiences of the ordinary people of Luvuvhu. This study does not only attempt to fill some gaps which exist in the history of the Ravele community, but it also attempts to view the history of Luvuvhu in a comparative light. The works mentioned in the literature review highlight the diverse interests of the authors in aspects of the history of Luvuvhu, but they do not deal sufficiently with the issues that this thesis is attempting to address. In addition, this paper’s uniqueness lies in the interpretation that is arrived at after an evaluation of the facts.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

A variety of source have been used for this study, consisting of oral interviews, archival material, books, thesis, newspapers, magazines and journal articles.

The main archival sources for this research are from the Department of Native Affairs, Water Affairs and Forestry, Bantu Administration Development, Native Commission (Louis Trichardt), Land Affairs, collected from the state archives in Pretoria. These records form the core of this study. These records filled a gap in the research, (especially the period under investigation). However, archival records showed the process of removal but do not reflect the experiences of ordinary people such as the economic and cultural hardships experienced during forced removal. These sources helped to explain when Ravele’s land became white settlement, why and how the Ravele community was removed and where to. Archival sources also helped to establish the nature of white settlement in the area and their effects on the Ravele community. Through investigation for example of Title Deeds one was also able to see the transfer of a farm from one person to another.

Interviews were conducted with ordinary people and chiefs who were living in the area under discussion and had been affected by the removal. Those who are responsible for land restitution were part of the research population. Through the interviews I wanted to describe the experiences of the people in the Ravele community.
The secondary sources used in this research were obtained from Rau Library, Wits Library, Unisa Library and the African Institute. They provided some information on forced removal, however, these sources failed to fill the gap in historiography of forced removal in the North East of the Northern Province and the full story is not told yet. It is hoped that this thesis will contribute to filling this gap.
CHAPTER 2

THE NATURE OF THE RAVELE COMMUNITY BEFORE FORCED REMOVAL

2.1 POPULATION COMPOSITION

The Luvuvhu River valley community consisted of the Vhavenda’s, Shangaans or Vatsonga, Northern Sotho’s and whites. The Ravele family were the main group of the Vhavenda and their main economic activities were farming or trading. According to Harries, the Ravele community lived in Luvuvhu according to their own social and religious customs for many years, while sharing the territory with the Vatsonga’s and the Northern Sotho. These groups lived side by side and their children played together and after the establishment of a school at Barotta, the children went to school together.\(^\text{12}\)

There was unity and understanding amongst the different ethnic groups in the area. There was no clear ethnic divisions and even extensive inter-marriage occurred. They were not concerned if their immediate chief or headman belonged to another tribe, since they were free to approach any chief with their problems. For example, there were Basotho, Shangaans or Vatsonga families living under the Venda headman, Mukhakhedzwa. Nonetheless these families still paid tribute to their chiefs.\(^\text{13}\)

As a result of tribal wars (seen as winter activities amongst themselves), inside the Luvuvhu valley (fighting for land and power before the 1920) people were encouraged to settle in groups. The tribal wars, made the society unstable. Most of these raids took place in winter since the community in the Luvuvhu valley regarded winter as a season of wars, because people were not busy. This instability made it easy for the government to intrude in the valley and also resulted in the emergence of various chiefdoms in Luvuvhu. Such chiefdoms were called after the name of the first chief, headman or conqueror to rule the area, the majority of these chiefdoms owed their allegiance to chief Mphephu, and the remaining to his rival brothers Sinthumule and Rasikhuthuma. Chiefdoms established included Ha-Mashau, HaRavele, HaMatumba, HaMatidza, HaMakatu, HaDavhana and Harasikhuma.\(^\text{14}\)
2.2 REASONS FOR SETTLEMENT

The Ravele community in the early 1800 was looking for land with both pastoral and agricultural character, in order to feed themselves and their livestock. As a result of its geographical and its climatic condition they had an interest in the Luvuvhu Valley. The area lies on the slopes and in the valleys of the Zoutpansberg mountains. The rainfall in the area is the heaviest in the Northern Transvaal and its alluvial soil is very fertile and easily worked, making it possible to farm many sub-tropical products. According to Conerly, the Luvuvhu valley was typical low-veld valley land, similar to the Zululand coastal land in regions of good rainfall. Unfortunately for the Luvuvhu valley, its tropical climate makes it prone to malaria.¹⁵

Not all parts of land occupied by the Ravele community were good enough for pastoral and agricultural purposes. The Ravele community believed that, on the mountains, rainfall diminished rapidly, falling over 60 mm on the mountains and 15 mm on the plains, from where it quickly tapers off until the arid and uninhabitable region which stretches, unbroken, to the Kruger National Park.¹⁶

The Ravele community had many ways of discouraging strangers (mostly white settlers as they were called) from coming to settle in their area. They even wanted to stop the government’s attempts to implement afforestation in their area. The information given to the land affairs committee before 1920's was deliberately misleading to prevent its intervention in the valley. The committee was told that the valley was uninhabitable - either by black or white since it was too stony, mountainous and too dry, for stock rearing and that farms on the southern part had no water. The Land Department officials were misled, mainly because they relied on Luvuvhu inhabitants for information, instead of investigating themselves. The Ravele’s were afraid of their land being taken away by whites. As a result, they resorted to lying, in order to protect their land. For in reality Luvuvhu valley was a place of great rainfall and fertility.¹⁷

According to the headman Vhavenda Ravele, the founder of the Ravele community descended from the
Ramabulana and lived at Vuvha in the Nzhelele valley on the present farm Seville 260MT. He goes on to say that, chief Makhado sent the Ravele clan to the Mauluma mountain on the present farm Barotta 17LT in about 1860. The main purpose was for the clan to guard against any possible attacks from his half-brother Davhana whom he had defeated in a war of succession. This means, there was forced removal even amongst the blacks. They were also afraid that, the Sinthumule community also had interest in the Luvuvhu valley because of its geographical and climatic conditions. At that time, the Voortrekker town of Schoemansdal was already established, west of the present day Louis Trichardt. During that time, the South African (Transvaal) Republic was spreading its authority over the Zoutpansberg region as it was interested in the valley. The Ravele community wanted to be independent and secure from these strangers (whites) and to achieve this, a strong leader was needed to protect the valley against them.18

2.3 DEMARCATION OF BOUNDARIES

Territorial boundaries determined the domain (*shango*) which the Ravele community controlled. According to N.V. Ralushai the Vhavenda boundaries, at that time were determined by natural, features for examples rivers, mountains and man made boundaries, like roads. The Ravele territory (Mauluma) in the Luvuvhu valley was also demarcated in a similar manner. Before the arrival of whites, such as Buys, it was difficult to use boundaries, because Mauluma area was one area and not divided by farms. These boundaries were not deemed necessary as Ravele’s lived amongst other groups in the valley.19

In Lisbon, on the northern border, was the Vuvha community separated on the east side by the Muunga river from the land of the Ratombmo community. On the southern side, Klein Australie farm was the border but this border was not restrictly adhered to as members of other communities stayed on the farm, for example, people under Masakona were also living on this land controlled by the Ravele’s while the Tshiungani headman stayed on the western boundary.20

In Barotta, there were not many distinctive boundaries since the Ravele community was in Barotta and also on other adjacent farms. In the east of Barotta there was Luvhungwe river bordering Mauluma
from the Tshakhuma community. In the north, there was a grazing area bordering Mauluma from the Mugwada community (Entabeni). In the south, the demarcation was the Louis Trichardt and Sibasa road. On the west, was the Ha-Bvumbi which marked the beginning of the Ha-Ravele community. Before the period of forced removal, Barotta was divided into two, namely, the north which was reserved for plantation and the south used for agriculture.\(^1\)

In Klein Australie (Matondoni) natural boundaries were used. On the eastern side, the boundary was the Lutanandwa River. On the southern side, the boundary between Matondoni area and Rasikhuthuma, was a rivulet called Vumbani. On the western side, the boundary between Matondoni and Ratombo was the Muunga river.\(^2\)

Luvuvhu farms, on the eastern side was bordered by the Luvhungwe river with Tshamukuyu running parallel to it. In between these rivers was the Ravele’s village. Lutanandwa river ran west of Tshamukuyu river and west of this was Gohohwe river. Between Tshamukuyu and Lutanandwa river, there were Ravele’s houses as well. These houses could also be seen between Lutanandwa and Goholwe river. All these rivers further south were traversed by the Louis Trichardt road while further south of this road was Masakona village which was not part of Luvuvhu farm. In other words, Luvuvhu road and rivers were boundaries between the Ravele community and Masakona village.\(^3\)

But as noted earlier the Ravele community was not boundary conscious as Raveles lived amongst other groups in the valley.

### 2.4 WAYS OF SURVIVAL

The Ravele people engaged in various activities in order to survive. They utilized many aspects of the environment such as plants, wild animals and clay, and so on to the full.

Cattle became of increasing value as it was used for bridewealth, for ploughing and as a source of milk, meat and skins in the years before the bovine epidemic at the turn of the century. But in 1938-39 a
severe foot and mouth epidemic swept from Rhodesia into the Transvaal, leading to the destruction of the Vhavenda cattle and goats.\textsuperscript{24}

The lala palm grew extensively throughout the valley, and was an essential part of the economy. The rachides of the palm leaf were used in the weaving of mats, bags, baskets and beer strainers while a twine, manufactured from the leaves, was used to bind the roofing poles of rondavels. The most vital part was the nutritious liquid drawn from the trunk of the palm which produced a gingerbeer-like drink when fresh and was a potent wine, when fermented. These products were exchanged with both black and white traders for articles or products lacking in the Ravele community.\textsuperscript{25}

Wild fruit such as Marula and sweet figs were also sources of food. Numerous other wild fruit trees were also exploited in the area, including the baobab. Large amounts of hard wood for building, morters, pestes, charcoal were supplied by a forest of mahogany trees.\textsuperscript{26} Hunting was an important economic activity exploited by the Ravele community for survival and protection.\textsuperscript{27} In those days hunting was not a sport, it was an industry. The meat provided both the settler and the Ravele community with food. The hides from these wild animals were used for clothing (for example shoes, jackets, belts and pants) and other articles like reins, whips, thogs, candles and soap were all made from animal fats. Ivory, elephant tusks and dried cured skins were exchanged for goods, which were bought by many traders who flocked to Schoemansdal. People in the Luvuvhu valley benefited substantially in the form of increased quantities of goods and money. Traders paid high prices for items like elephant tusks.\textsuperscript{28}

The Ravele community also participated in hunting in order to protect themselves against white settlers. In those early days only the settlers handled guns as the sale of guns to blacks was strictly prohibited by the white trackers and settlers. They employed blacks as trackers because of their immense skills. The trackers were, by necessity, given guns and ammunition so they could hunt elephants. Hence as trackers people in the Luvuvhu valley including the Ravele community gained access to guns.\textsuperscript{29}

As time went on the Ravele communities felt that white settlers desired control over their land. To stop
that, a strategy was devised to obtain guns to defend themselves. In the middle of the 19th century, the Venda trackers claimed, there were large herds of elephant behind one of the mountains in the Luvuvhu valley. The Vhavenda trackers and hunters were given guns in large numbers, so that they could collect ivory. Once they obtained them the Ravele hunters went straight back and handed their chief the guns.30

This ploy by the Ravele people strained the relationship between them and white settlers. The settlers tried to persuade the Luvuvhu valley people to return the guns, but when they refused the white settlers tried to get their guns back by force. Tension started building up in the area and under cover of darkness, the Luvuvhu valley warriors attacked farms, stole cattle, guns and ammunition, burnt down houses and even murdered people, all with the aim of scaring the whites.31

The settlers felt unprotected and no longer went on hunting trips, as they were reluctant to leave their families unprotected. Traders were also not keen to visit the Luvuvhu valley, for fear of being attacked and losing all their goods. This was an achievement by the Ravele community; as they had succeeded, for the time being, in scaring white settlers from entering the Luvuvhu valley.32

This showed that in order to gain skills to protect their land against white settlers and in addition, gain means of survival, the Ravele community decided to send strong leaders, to work on white farms, since according to the Ravele’s, the best form of defence was to know the enemy. While earning an income on these farms, they learned how to handle a gun enabling them later to be recruited to became elephant hunters, where they had a chance of stealing the much-sought-after guns.33

There were also other means of survival amongst the Ravele community and others in the Luvuvhu valley. People melted iron for ploughing equipment on Lisbon farm. Marula fruit was collected in the valley for beer making. They also traded in clay for pot making, with the people of Mashau tribe. They also used special trees like “Mutondo” to make wooden dishes (Ndilo). All of these, they used not only for their survival but for sale of the surpluses to other communities in the Luvuvhu valley.34

Most activities in the valley centred around farming. Apart from a plot in the back yard, a family had a
piece of land on the river bank (Mutanga) or one on a hillslope (Tshikovha), and the main or family field. In this community, while gifts and business transactions may involve the exchange of land, the main field never exchange hands. It was the property and identity of each family. The main field was also the measure of success and stability for each family. Put in other words, it was the symbol of life and continuity and therefore the identity for that particular family. Land provided and created a specific identity and continuity as it carried ownership, from one generation to another generation. This identity was reflected in the way villagers greeted a visitor. A Luvuvhu greeting was never complete until the person inquired about the rain as well as the state of crops in the area one was coming from. This was an indication of the significance of land and agriculture.35

The Ravele community and others in the Luvuvhu valley, cultivated their crops and used them mainly for consumption. The Ravele community and others in the area, planted millet, groundnuts (Phonda), traditional sugar cane, sweet potato, pumpkins, fruit trees such as oranges, lemons, banana’s and pawpaw trees. There were three kinds of fields: around the homesteads, these were fields for chiefs and headmen, which where meant to feed the whole community during times of hunger. This was followed by the fields for ordinary people. In all these fields, the same kind of crops were planted as the quality of the soil was the same. Fruit trees were planted around the homestead, as resting place and protection against heavy storms. The last portion of land was divided into different usage portions, such as a portion for grazing fields and another as ploughing fields.36 A great deal of labour was needed to protect the crops from monkeys, baboons and birds. During harvesting period, rewards of beer parties drew labour from local kin as well as from other ethnic groups in the area.

The Luvuvhu valley also had specific trees that were used to make tools and medicines. For example “Tshikhopha”, (aloe) was used to cure cuts or wounds. They also depended on wild fruits for survival, for example “mavhungo”, (wild granadilla). Houses were made from mud and branches of trees, roofs were made of grass. Grass was easily available on each field and were used mainly for roofing. The Ravele community took part in all these activities in order to protect themselves and also for survival.37

2.5 THE ROLE OF THE CHIEF AND CULTURE
A chief had various duties to perform within the community. People’s tradition was rural and this meant that their lives revolved around the land. The great chief through his “gota” (petty chief) apportioned land to “mukoma” (headmen) for dispensation to the people. The chief only allocated and ruled the land but did not own it as his private property. It was a property inherited from his forefathers. At times, he was referred to as “mavu” (soil) meaning the owner of the soil in a literal sense. The chief merely held the land in trust for his people. Letsoalo, writing on the connection of the chief with land ownership amongst the North-Soto, asserted that the chief is not a separate individual from his subjects. One therefore, may argue that the tenure system that was practised was communal, whereby land belonged to everybody, under the guardian of the chief.38

Chieftaincies, as traditional institutions, formed the basis around which Vhavenda (Ravele’s amongst them) in Luvuvhu were politically and socially organised. Gottschling argued that there was a tribal constitution in each chieftaincy. Evidence from the Native Location Commission of 1907 indicated that the Vhavenda chieftaincy, after the death of Thohoyandou was divided between his sons Mphephu, Sinthumule, Maemu and Davhana, as well as, between indunas and petty chiefs. Though Gottschling’s point is to a large extent correct, he did not explain how chiefs such as those in Luvuvhu obtained their positions, despite the fact that they were not Thohoyandou’s descendants. Some obtained their elevated positions as a result of services they had rendered to the great chief, such as, leading the “tshira” (army).39

It was the duty of the chief to provide land and security for his subjects. The chief also acted as a decision-maker, spiritual leader and a provider. The community of Mauluma was under the chief (Khosi) Vho-Ravele. The chief was assisted by the headman (gota).40

The chief had the powers to allocate land to anyone, including “strangers”, such as Buys and Trichardt, but on condition that they would abide and follow the rules of that tribe. Furthermore, the people were free to choose where they wanted to reside and permission was required only when they were moving from wider jurisdiction of one chief to another. If the movement was within the same chiefdom, no
permission was needed. Giving permission to move to other chiefdoms served as a regulatory measure intended to discourage large numbers of people from joining other chiefdoms as this would have a detrimental effect on their former chiefdoms. For such actions would undermine the military strength of their former chiefs and it would reduce the amount of tribute they (chiefs) got from their subjects. People also moved to other chiefdoms due to natural hazards like, droughts or floods and as refugees of wars. This has been the practice in Luvuvhu.41

The chief had his own ploughing field known as “Dzunde”. This field had to be worked by his own subjects. The main purpose of this field was to provide food for the royal family and his subjects in times of famine. For example, it was at the farm Barotta, where the head kraal (Musanda) of Ha-Ravle was situated, at a place calle d Matondoni, and their ploughing fields were situated in the area. The headmen also had their own kraal in the area.42

The chief or headman allocated a piece of land to every man who got married. Land allocated to every household would depend on the number of wives of the man. If the man had three wives, three pieces of land would be allocated one for each wife plus a portion for the head of the family. The head of the family’s field, was worked by all wives. It is worth noting that women were free to plough anything on their pieces of land.43

The chief gave his people the right to hunt and white settlers were charged for hunting on the Ravle chief’s domain. The chief charged taxes in the form of goats, cattle and money. It was the duty of the chief to make sure that each hunter paid tax. If not, a penalty was implemented in the tribal court (khoro).44

The coming of whites in the early 1820’s therefore, disrupted the age-old tradition of giving land to strangers. This was because the Vhavenda and the whites had different perceptions about private ownership of property. When chief Ravle granted land to white farmers such as Buys, Luvhisi, (Louis Trichardt), Joao Albasini (known as Tshiwawa) and Borchers, he did not realise the difference between the white and the African concepts of land ownership and tenure. Ownership of land in many African
communities was communal. It was not his personal property.\footnote{45}

There was no special cemetery (graveyard) to bury the dead, but they were buried around the homesteads. If the head of the household had livestock, they would be buried inside the kraal. Old people were buried in cattle skin. The chiefs (khosi) were buried in special graves called “Tshiendeulu” or royal graveyard. These graveyards were a distance from the homestead. For example, Chief Vele Ravele was buried in the Barotta royal grave yard. The main purpose of this division, was to divide the royals from the commoners and Tshiendeulu was regarded as a scared place. The power of the chief was believed to come from ancestors buried there. This means, it was the duty of the chief to indicate where one was supposed to be buried.\footnote{46}

The Vhavenda performed different kinds of rituals for different purpose. In many of these rituals the chief played the most important role. For example, in order to protect his people against any kind of attack such as enemies or diseases, a ritual was suppose to be performed. This was also the case with the Ravele community, which performed rituals, such as thanks-giving ceremonies, which were performed mostly in their graveyards. Millet beer was sprinkled with maize-meal on top of the graves, as well as the slaughtering of cattle. The main purpose, was to thank their ancestors for what they had done for them; so that they may continue to protect them or to provide for them further.\footnote{47}

The chief had the right to protect his land and the rights of his citizens. Chiefs in the Luvuvhu valley were aware of the effects of having Luvuvhu declared a white area hence their anxiety at the appearance of the white settlers. Their grievances were genuine, more about land and natural resources garnered from it. In his evidence during meeting of the propose settlement, Mphephu argued that “it is very unfortunate to hear that we will have to stay in an area reserved for us, where we would have to buy land or pay rent. As you know a child inherits what his father leaves him after his death.” For Vhavenda, it was not only their land that was at stake, but their culture. Giving them an area reserved for them meant that they would be unable to inherit land from their fathers. A man desiring more land would not be able to get it from the headman because land in areas reserved for them would be inadequate to accommodate all the people. Buying land would also usurp the powers and functions of the headmen and chiefs, since
the blacks commissioner would be responsible for that. 48

Chief Ravele indicated that, “our custom is to have plenty of food and plenty of cattle to buy our wives, but to buy land is very difficult, as we are not used to buying land.” Traditionally among the Vhavenda land was not acquired through the market system, as is the case in western culture. Letsoalo noted that amongst the Pedi, membership of tribe was the price of a piece of land. Nobody was jealous of another tribesman who needed more land as agricultural work was not merely an occupation or a source of income but a way of life. Membership of the tribe was a qualification to obtain sufficient land to support the family. The new system of buying land was thus contrary to their culture. Therefore, without the ability to purchase land, communities were confined to small or unproductive patches of land. 49

The Vhavenda and others in the Luvuvhu valley lived as a unit. This was indicated by chief Mphephu, who objected against any sort of removal, because it would affect the families adversely, since they would be scattered all over. They didn’t want to move because of their strong cultural and religious attachment to their land and on account of their ancestors who were buried in Luvuvhu. Stayt has made a point that, throughout the country, there were places reputed to be inhabited by the spirits, whose sinister presence was greatly feared and who could influence the lives of the living people. Many of these forests were burying places of chiefs and in these graves they generally left trees to grow around them, and they would maintain the tradition of being regarded as sacred graves. Matumba asserted that such places were scary because the people respected their chiefs and that, “khosi yo vhewa nga Mudzimu” that “God appointed chiefs.” 50 The implication of disrespecting the chief, who they regarded as an intermediary with God, implied disrespecting God. However, all Vhavenda chiefs, including those in Luvuvhu, every year visited regularly their royal graves for “thevhula” ritual. “Thevhula” is a thanksgiving ceremony conducted by the royal family at the ancestor’s grave after the first harvest. This helps to unify all the people of the tribe and those found in the royal family as the ceremony included feasting, drinking and dancing to the tshikona tribal dance. Moving out of Luvuvhu would imply that people would no longer be united, since they would no longer perform “thevhula”. 51 The chief gave to his followers a sense of belonging and unity by using symbols of office that were believed to invest him with special powers and by organizing various rites that were limited to clan
members, such as first fruit ceremonies and entry to the age regiments.\textsuperscript{52}

There were many cultural activities amongst the Ravele community. For example “Domba” or initiation for young women conducted, in winter, out in the royal kraal. The main aim was to teach them how to handle their families after marriage. During weekends both men and women had different cultural activities either in the chief’s kraal or in any other part of the village. These dances include, Tshikona, Visa, Tshigombela and Matangwa dances. The cultural activities mentioned above, together with initiation schools, such as, Murundu, Musevhetho and games such as Khororo (Traditional golf) and Ndode (game with stones) were the informal schools until the introduction of formal schooling by the Berlin Missionary society, in the 19th century, in Barotta.\textsuperscript{53}

\section*{2.6 RELATIONSHIP WITH WHITE SETTLERS}

Relationship with white settlers, has a bearing on the nineteenth century and the roots of enmity between black and white. Circumstances surrounding the relations between Ravele together with other blacks, and the whites can only be explained in economic terms since the Zoutpansberg economy was based on hunting. Elephant ivory and animal skins were exchanged for beads and guns by the blacks with, especially, the Portuguese, English, Belgians and Asians. The Luvuvhu valley hunting ground was controlled by Vhavenda, and as Wagner has noted, four main trade routes converged at the valley. It was not only of agricultural importance, it was an important trade route which many people wished to acquire access to. Hunting however led to scarcity of animals, as they were killed in large numbers without being given the opportunity to reproduce.\textsuperscript{54}

To aggravate the worsening relationship, hut tax was levied on blacks to force them to work. By allowing whites to collect tax, the Luvuvhu community felt betrayed by their chiefs. Wagner makes the point that, those who were classified as workers, (i.e. working on farms) were relieved of the obligation to pay the hut-tax.\textsuperscript{55}

Albasini led the Shangaans and Tsonga’s against the Luvuvhu community under Ramabulana, (the
Ravele’s were amongst them) in the 1850’s. As a result Albasini became a threat amongst the Luvuvhu
valley community. His threat therefore, contributed to the establishment of chiefdoms in Luvuvhu,
designed to counteract his activities. Therefore, conflict between the two was unavoidable. It was
reported that, during these conflicts, many Vhavenda drowned in the Lutanandwa river.\textsuperscript{56} Albasini built a
strong presence and for himself, evidence suggests that, there had been peaceful and economic relations
between him and Vhavenda’s in the past. It was only when he amassed extra support and wanted to
control the Venda’s (who were living in the area) that the relationship changed. For him controlling the
Luvuvhu community would mean controlling the rich hunting grounds. This strained the relationship
between Albasini and the combined communities of Luvuvhu valley.\textsuperscript{57}

Stayt notes that there was an unhealthy relationship between the Luvuvhu community (including the
Ravele’s) and the Shangaans. Since Albasini was a Native Commissioner and chief of the Shangaans of
the Zoutpansberg, he was hated by the Vhavenda because he collected tax from them using his
Shangaan followers as policemen and tax collectors. This indicates that, Shangaans (under Albasini) in
the Transvaal had never fought against whites; instead they had assisted whites to fight other tribes.\textsuperscript{58}
An example is of chief Mavambe who in 1898 assisted the whites against Mphephu with 800 men, who
according to JD Rheinhalt Jones, did an excellent service. To make the situation worse, the Native
Location Commission of 1907 gave Shangaan induna Shigalo 500 morgen of land along the banks of
Luvuvhu. The Native Commissioner Schiel had given Shigalo the place in 1888 in order to act as a
buffer against the Vhavenda who occupied Luvuvhu in large numbers. However, after the defeat of
Mphephu in 1898, the necessity of having a buffer against Vhavenda no longer existed. This enmity
which was created between Shangaans and Vhavenda by Albasini still exists today.\textsuperscript{59}

Many whites stayed in the Luvuvhu valley temporary housing during the hunting season. Later, Beaufort
farm was granted to Petrus Weeber in 1871, Welgevonden was granted to Jan Weeber in 1873, Jan
Venter was given Driefontein in 1872, but later transferred it to Gerd Borchers and Wilhelm Borchers in
1904. Levubu was granted to Hendrikus Van Boeschoten in 1870, but as from 1889, it was the
property of John Cooksley. The implication of these transfers meant that the inhabitants of the Luvuvhu
community were soon paying rent to white landlords. This means whites were not only taking their land
away, even their freedom. Laws made provision for the extration of rent from local black residents whose relatives were involved in migrant labour activities. This worsened their relationship as whites were not only taking their land away but were subjecting them to taxes and forced labour. The Vhavenda were made aliens in their own land. They were not even consulted when their land was given away to white settlers. They were not regarded as the bona fide owner of the land by the government because they had no documentation.60

Another white group influencing relationship in the Luvhuvhu valley was the Berlin and Swiss missionary society. They undermined the powers of chiefs, because they did not respect the rules of such chiefs. Instead, they wanted these chiefs to pay tax and to supply labourers to them. This reduced the area that the chief controlled, particularly, after the defeat of Mphephu in 1899.61 The present site where the former Berlin mission station of Tshakhuma is situated is representative of the substantive presence of Venda people in the Luvuvhu area. Cross-cultural interaction was the order of the day in the vicinity of the mission. It would undoubtedly have affected the structure and functioning of the Ravele community.

2.7 SIGNIFICANCE

In this chapter, I have attempted to show the population composition, reason for settlement, how the communities survived in the valley, role of the chiefs, how the Ravele’s authority and the territory that fell under their jurisdiction changed over time because of the coming of white settlers. I have also tried to show the relationship between the Ravele community and white settlers in the Luvuvhu valley. This contact between the white settlers and the blacks led to reduction of land belonging to the Luvuvhu community.62 The powers of their chiefs were reduced. Their cultural practices, especially, those dependent on the availability of land were adversely affected. Though they maintained their independence to a certain extent by paying rent to landlords who occupied part of their land, they did not carry out their cultural activities freely, but first had to ask permission from the Native Commissioners. The powers wielded by these whites led to land dispossession of the Luvuvhu community, which later led to the establishment of a white Luvuvhu settlement. Land dispossession within the context of this study did not mean removal from the land, this would happen later.63
CHAPTER 3

LAND DISPOSSESSION

Forced removal and land dispossession have been central dimensions of oppression in the Luvuvhu
valley since the first white settlers landed in the Far Northern Transvaal. It is quite interesting for one to note that, when the question is asked among the Ravele community, as to why people were removed from Luvuvhu valley, (the place they stayed in for so long), their replies varied considerably from place to place and person to person). This illustrates vividly, how many different reasons the authority advanced for removing people forced out of their land and highlights what a complicated issue relocation is.

The United Party government in the late “1930's” become very cautious about uprooting people for fear of criticism from within as well as from abroad. But this was not the case in the 1920's and early 1930's. Very little or no publicity was given to the forced removals. Neither the newspapers nor other media, such as radio, had any interest in those early forced removals. To understand the relocation of the Ravele community, one has to look into the effects of different Acts passed, such as the Land Settlement Act, 1912, Forestry Act, 1913, Land Act, 1913 and 1936. Other aspects, such as, the poor white problem also played a role.

3.1 THE EFFECTS OF THE LAND SETTLEMENT ACT, 1912, FORESTRY ACT, 1913 AND LAND ACT, 1913

This part focuses on the different Acts passed with the aim of dispossessing land occupied by blacks. These Acts also affected the Ravele community and other blacks in the Luvuvhu valley. The other intention is to show how these acts changed over time in order to accommodate the needs of white settlers.

3.1.1 Dispossessions of farms

In terms of section 2 of the Development Trust and Land Act, 1936 (Act No. 18 of 1936). The Luvuvhu valley area was not scheduled as a black area in terms of the Land Act, 1913 (Act No. 27 of 1913) but was included in Released area No. 26, District of Zoutpansberg and Province of the Transvaal. This area (Mauluma in the Luvuvhu valley) was divided into different farms and given different colonial names, by the white settlers who came after the arrival of the Ravele’s under
Mphephu. These farms were Barotta No. 17LT2 and 3(63), portion of Levubu No. 15LT, portion of Klein Australie No. 13LT (Entabeni), portion of Lisbon No. 12LT (Entabeni Forest), northern portion of Levubu No. 15LT, eastern portion of Nooitgedaght No. 14LT and eastern portion of Appelsfontein No. 35LT. A key objective of the 1913 Land Act, as Keegan has observed, was the eradication of black farmers, who depended on subsistence economy for their survival. The government intended to remove the Ravele community from the Luvuvhu valley for settlement by white farmers. The government’s intentions were supported by the 1913 Act, which prohibited land purchase by blacks outside of scheduled reserve areas, making these the only places where Africans could occupy land. The act thus effectively ensured that Africans would have to seek wage employment in order to secure their economic survival.

The 1913 Land Act, Forestry Act, 1913 and Land Settlement Act, 1912 led to the dispossession of the farm Lisbon in 1921. The farm was bought by chief Mphephu (the Ravele’s were under him and living on the farm) in 1910. There were different views concerning the dispossession of farm Lisbon from chief Mphephu. According to land affairs officials chief Mphephu had trouble in repaying the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association the sum of £2 700, which they had advanced to assist in the purchase of an undivided half portion of the farm Lisbon 12LT in 1910. Mphephu insisted that he had repaid the amount in full. In order to solve the matter, it was decided that, a collection be made from the tribe. A meeting of the Induna’s and chiefs who represented the tribe fully, was held and a statement to this effect was signed by them. According to H. Nemudzivhadi there was no clue as to whether Mphephu did or did not pay his debts. The native commissioner in Louis Trichardt, stated that, the outstanding debt was never paid in full. The Mphephu royal kraal denied the native commissioner’s report and claimed it was blatant stealing of their land.

Even though chief Mphephu reiterated his previous statements that he had fully paid for the farm, his assertions fell on deaf ears. According to Nemudzivhadi, Mphephu believed that, the farm was being taken away from him for no reason at all, except that, he was black. To show its authority, the state sold the farm in 1921 before even resolving the matter with chief Mphephu. The farm was sold to a white settler Mr Gilbertson. Chief Mphephu gave his followers the right to decide whether they would work on Mr Gilbertson’s farm or not. Those who had the desire to leave the farm were given the
options to do so, without compensation. After some discussion, blacks present agreed to Mr Gilbertson’s new conditions without a single dissentent. This means, blacks on the farm (including the Ravele community) agreed to work for Gilbertson, as farm labourers on farm Oorlogsfontein, district of Potgietersrus and on Lisbon 12LT itself. Even though Mr Gilbertson removed them from Lisbon 12LT he showed some kindness by allowing the Ravele community and other blacks to remain in Lisbon 12LT, for three months, within which to reap their crops before calling them to work.

The Ravele community and other blacks in Lisbon 12LT decided to become farm labourers because they wanted security. Mphephu feared that, if his subjects refused to work, they would be driven off and followers of his brother chief Sinthumule, would be placed on the farm, especially those under headman Mutheiwnana. The two were in competition for land and power in the valley. According to N.V. Ralushai, the Sinthumule’s were actually, at that moment, under notice to quit an adjoining farm and were waiting to see whether there was any chance of their being allowed to settle on Lisbon 12LT. As a result of the competition for land between the two chiefs, it was easy for white settlers to obtain labour. This indicated that, it was not only laws that were used to dispossess the Ravele’s land, conflict among themselves laid fertile ground for dispossession.

Mr Gilbertson occupied Lisbon 12LT for economic gain. While the Ravele community and others were staying in Lisbon under Mr Gilbertson as labour tenants in 1921, Gilbertson and other white settlers went to the chief and of the same time ordered the people to move as they want to plant trees. The Ravele’s refused to move out. Mr Gilbertson responded by planting trees around their homestead. The Ravele’s and others who had refused to move were instructed to see to it that their cattle did not eat any of the trees. This was difficult for the Ravele community. Some were arrested because their cattle and goats ate the trees. Brute force was then used, to move them. Trees were cut down in front of their homesteads, so that access to their homesteads would be difficult. Hence, the proverb “Ngilimane Tshitopeni Kutamani yo sia Mutshinyalo” meaning, “the pick and shovel of destruction that took place happened.” The above measures led to the destruction of the Ravele’s properties and their removal from Lisbon.
The Ravele community and other blacks in the valley started to complain about the size of allotments and regulations forbidding the cutting of trees and gathering of fallen branches for fencing and fuel (for which heavy fines of five pounds could be imposed) if they infringed this law. They started to oppose the annual grazing fee of 38s (payable in advance). In addition, they complained about being abused by agricultural officers. All this was done to make life unbearable for the Ravele community. All this was done to put more pressure on the Ravele community and other blacks in Lisbon, Mr Gilbertson forbade Tshikona dance (one of the Ravele’s important activity), because of its noise.

3.1.2 Irrigation scheme and forestry plantation

Irrigation scheme and forestry plantation led to the dispossession of Luvuvhu valley from the Ravele community and other blacks in the valley. However, we do not know the views of the Ravele community expressed about the Luvuvhu valley irrigation and forestry schemes.

This situation led historians such as Delius, et al to consider irrigation scheme and forestry plantation as something tied up with ideas about state control over the reserves. The research shows that, far from being a social upliftment programme, the irrigation scheme was part of the broader measures aimed at alienating Africans from the land. Delius et al pointed out that the widespread resistance to the new measures was an indication that the irrigation scheme was ill-conceived as an upliftment programme.

As a result of its unproductivity, Gilbertson, decided to sell Lisbon 12LT to the Department of Lands in 1922, for forestry purposes. According to Nemudzivhadi, the Ravele community viewed this latest move, also as a long term strategy by the government to take the Ravele’s land away. In order to entice labour tenants to remain in Lisbon, the government introduced incentives. It was reported on 4 July 1923 that, “In view of the fact that the District Forest Officer had all the native tenants residing on the farm Lisbon 12LT, District Zoutpansberg, put on a farm labour contract, no taxes would be required from them.”

The 1912 Settlement Act and 1913 Forestry Act also affected the Ravele community in Lisbon, and
those residing at Klein Australie. It led to the plantation of bluegum and pine trees in Klein Australie. This forestry plantation led to the removal of the Ravele community out of Klein Australie in 1925. This is another indication that the government viewed black people’s lives as unimportant as compared to forestry plantation. Part of the Ravele community was living on the farm Welgevoden and surrounding farms. After the report was received in respect of farms Lisbon and Klein Australie, Welgevonden was also acquired, according to the Forestry Act of 1913 and Land Settlement Act of 1912. This reduced the Ravele community to a state of dependency and subordination as fertile spots were taken by the government for forestry purposes and others given to white settlers. It was not a complete removal, the intention was also to make labourers available under specific conditions.

The secretary for Lands and secretary for Native Affairs had conflicting ideas about the position of labour tenants in the Luvuvhu valley. The Secretary for Lands informed the Department of Native Affairs on 30 August 1923 that “this Department would welcome as many as possible natives on the farm Welgevoden, District of Zoutpansberg, being put on farm labour contracts, in view of irrigation works which are at present in the course of construction on the farm.” It was not the intention to disturb any of the blacks, pending the allotment of the farm to settlers. Those being put on farm labour contract, therefore did not have to vacate the farm. After the farm had been allotted to settlers, blacks would be able to come to some kind of an agreement with the white settlers.

The Secretary for Native Affairs was informed on 19 December 1924, by the Secretary for Lands, that steps were taken to invite applications for allotment of certain irrigable holdings on the above farm under the Land Settlement Act, 1912. A statutory notice to the blacks concerned was issued, to advise them that on allotment they were occupying they may be required to vacate the above land, hence should start making plans for such an eventuality. Some of the blacks were taken on as farm labourers by the settlers, but those who were not employed vacated the farm on request and moved to places of their own choice.

The Secretary of Native Affairs had this to say: “The Department has been informed that, the native are cultivating portions of the grazing area. The natives should be given to understand that further farming
operations must cease. I shall be glad if you will advise me of the action taken as the result of this minute. It is understood that, the natives are entitled to three month’s notice, but perhaps you will confirm.” The Native Commissioner Soutpansberg confirmed on 29 December 1924 that, he had acted accordingly. Their stay on the farm was apparently terminated in 1925. The irrigation scheme made the Ravele community dependent on white farmers for survival as their sole means of production was taken away from them. The agricultural officers didn’t only prevent people from ploughing, they also put stringent control on other natural resources. Under these circumstances, the chief’s authority, which was based on an ability to grant these resources to people, was seriously undermined.  

An extract from the 1936 native economic commission report, echoes this scenario: Irrigation scheme, and forestry plantation meant different things to different people in the Luvuvhu valley. Generally, many people indicated how irrigation scheme and forestry plantation through agricultural officers, reduced their arable land in the Luvuvhu valley.  

State officials believed that, the policy would help to boost agricultural production in the Luvuvhu valley and create jobs. On the contrary, it made living conditions worse among the people in the Luvuvhu valley. These new methods effectively alienated the predominantly subsistence farming community from the land they desperately needed. The agricultural officers didn’t understand the symbolic meaning of ploughing field to the Ravele community. While they saw their actions as noble, they ran into conflict with local people.  

3.2 THE EFFECTS OF THE LAND ACT, 1936

The Luvuvhu valley area was not scheduled as a black area, but was included in Released area No. 26, Districts of the Transvaal in terms of section 2 of the Development Trust and Land Act, 1936 (Act No. 18 of 1936). Such land could be purchased by the South African Development Trust (SADT) for black settlement or by a black in terms of section 10 and 11 of the 1936 Act. This however did not include any land which had been reserved or area declared for forestry under the Forestry Act of 1913 (Act No. 16 of 1913) and land for irrigation settlement under the Land Settlement Act, 1912 (Act No.
12 of 1912 as amended). The Luvuvhu valley, “(which the Ravele’s resided in)”, also fell under forestry demarcated areas under the inspection of the Louis Trichardt Commissioner.\textsuperscript{94}

During the 1930's, the state introduced other tactics in order to remove the Ravele and other blacks from the Luvuvhu valley. The main purpose was to empower and to encourage white settlers in the area. In order to achieve this, some land had to be excised. As a result, the secretary for Native Affairs was informed by the secretary for Lands on April 1936 (i.e. before the commencement of Act No. 18 of 1936) as follows: “I have to inform you that, this department has recently purchased part of Luvuvhu valley in respect of the irrigation scheme and as the government desires to proceed with the layout of the scheme with as little delay as possible.”\textsuperscript{95} A committee of the Native Affairs commission visited Louis Trichardt during August 1936 and reported inter alia as follows: \textsuperscript{96} The government wanted steps to be taken, in order to remove the Ravele’s and other blacks, together with their stocks on farms to be excised. The first application for excision concerned the farms from Released Areas, 26 (where the Ravele’s and other blacks were staying).\textsuperscript{97}

The department also had an option to purchase the remaining extent of the farm Barotta, but no definite decision was made in regard to purchase of this property. If purchased, it would also be necessary that the Ravele community be removed from there. They were given up to the end of July 1936 in order to harvest their crops.\textsuperscript{98} The philosophy about land and conservation (combating soil erosion, protecting nature etc) led to the removal of this section of the Ravele community.

The matter concerning the removal of the Ravele community and others in Luvuvhu valley was then referred to the Chief Native Commissioner, Northern Areas. In order to finalise their removal he replied that, it was impossible to make the necessary arrangements for the removal of the people from the farms. He referred to minutes received from the additional Native Commissioner, Louis Trichardt, who commented as follows: “I have the honour to bring to your notice that, this matter, which has been sprung upon me and the natives without previous warning, will entail the removal of no less than 2300 souls - this is a very conservative estimate - with some 1300 head of small stock. The locality of the farms in question is very congested and as it is composed entirely of privately owned farms, I
anticipate that only an infinitesimal number of the blacks will be able to find accommodation in my area.\textsuperscript{99}

By preserving reserve areas, the act also prevented complete landlessness amongst Africans, so that in theory at least, they would be in a position to secure the means of subsistence agricultural production and other forms of land use such as livestock rearing. But that was not the case. The Sibasa Additional Commissioner, had this to say about the proposed land on which to resettle the Ravele community and others in the Luvuvhu valley: “It may be possible for these people to find places on the crown lands and locations on this side of the boundary, but he feels, as I do, that insufficient time has been allowed. At least three full months should be to given the natives to find other places of residence and I must accordingly request that, the Department of Lands be asked to extend the time granted to the 31 August 1936. It will be impossible to effect the removals by the 31 July 1936. In the meantime, I shall warn the natives through their headmen that they must make early arrangements for finding new domiciles.”\textsuperscript{100}

An official of the Department of Native Affairs, Mr D.L. Smit, who discussed the proposed application of Chapter IV of the Native Trust and Land Act with Additional Native Commissioner at Sibasa and the Native Commissioner and Additional Native Commissioner at Louis Trichardt during July 1937, set out the gist of their discussion as follows: Additional Native Commissioner, Biddell thought that some of these tenants would be kept on as labourers when the irrigable plots were ready. In addition the privately owned portions of Laasgevonden, Barotta and Driefontein could absorb large numbers.\textsuperscript{101} It was proposed that Driefontein should develop into a citrus farm. This would need lots of labour. Although they were 13 000 it did not mean all would be moved. It would be fair to assume that only one half would have to move.\textsuperscript{102} Until they developed the relocation areas, according to Biddell, it would be quite impossible to apply Chapter IV of the act in respect of surplus people. The mission lands were already overcrowded and could not absorb any more blacks. For some, arrangements were made to be relocated on to crown farms.\textsuperscript{103}
3.2.1 Efforts to obtain alternative land

This meant that for the Ravele’s, alternative land was supposed to be provided. This was not an easy task for the Native Commissioners so for the time being the Ravele community, together with others, were allowed to stay in the Luvuvhu valley. They couldn’t plant anything because they were waiting for removal at any time. As a result they depended on the white settlers for survival.104

Meetings took place in Louis Trichardt on 9th September 1936 with the purpose of looking for alternative land for Ravele community. According to information received by Bresler (who was an exceptional agricultural officer), there were good farms, with few exceptions. But the great majority were already densely populated with blacks. These farms lie to the south-east and north-east of Louis Trichardt.105 Paradise-Baobab was not much good - stoney but with good grazing. The farms on the Nwanedi River were very dry as they were in the low rainfall area. Bresler had this to say “The Nwanedi River is a perennial stream and you could settle some natives along the river but it would not support many unless you develop irrigation.”106 Bresler wanted the Ravele community and other blacks to be removed to a place where they would be able to depend upon themselves for survival, by acquiring good land. Bresler also intended to avoid any form of resistance from the Luvuvhu community. Bresler suggestions were over-ruled by the government. They did not understand why blacks were supposed to be given land suitable for agriculture. The arguments were: where are they going to get labourers for white settler’s farms?107

Then in order to make removal possible government promised compensation for the land to be excised in the Luvuvhu valley. The government, offered two farms, Grootplasts and Groenkloof adjoining Molima’s location and Emmett (an agricultural officer) thought that a number of people would go to that area. It was thought that, the rest who remained would not object.108 An agricultural officer, Currie, suggested consultation with the Zoutpansberg farmers union before any removal implementation. Another suggestion was to buy adjoining Mpefu’s and Msekwa’s locations on the line Zwartfontein to Amanda and if necessary on to Bali. The farms to the South from Parkfield to Beaconsfield were mountainous and of no value to white farmers.109
But Hirson has this to say about the land to be purchased by the Trust. The land he said was overpopulated, the terrain was hilly, and through the early thirties there have been droughts everywhere. In addition the proposed land was already densely populated, rocky and infertile, generally a piece of land which white settlers would not want. Taxpayers were promised two morgens of land and non-taxpayers, i.e. old men, widows and unmarried women, one and half morgens each.\textsuperscript{110}

Unhappy about these removals, farmers demanded the application of chapter 4 of the 1936 Act to the area-presumably under the mistaken impression that, all the rent-paying blacks in the area would immediately convert themselves into labour tenants (it was the state of affairs throughout the country). For example, the land along the Zoutpansberg, set aside for black population was in the same category. On the contrary, according to Van Onselen, evidence received everywhere, was that, the rent paying tenants rarely became labour tenants. The Ravele’s who were not cattle enthusiasts would be less likely to stay than others.\textsuperscript{111}

3.3 POOR WHITES PROBLEM

In the 1930’s, the Luvuvhu settlement accommodated a large percentage of new arrivals who were classified as poor whites. Despite the fact that the majority of them were poor, they co-existed alongside a small proportion of wealthy landowners who rented out land to Vhavenda’s (including the Ravele’s) and Shangaans. While Vhavenda and Shangaans, over time, lost their ability to live off the land, and were condemned to lives of miserable poverty, the poor whites, with the sympathetic support of the government, were given a chance to start afresh. The major feature of this settlement was the growth of racism as a code that cemented both ethnic solidarity and racial superiority. This was what Delius et al call “accumulation and dispossession.”\textsuperscript{112}

From the early 1900’s onwards, the state made efforts to raise agricultural productivity with measures that included the Land Settlement Act of 1912 which aimed at encouraging the poor white farmers to produce more and thus pull themselves out of their poverty.\textsuperscript{113} Through the Act the state earmarked
settlements in the countryside and channelled funds to them as this was considered the best solution to the poor white problem.\textsuperscript{114} To implement such a scheme required that rural areas be freed from African occupation hence creating space for white settlement. As a result, a number of white settlers were stationed north of the Zoutpansberg (i.e. Luvuvhu valley), in order to solve the problem of poverty.\textsuperscript{115}

It was reported on the 14th of October 1935 that an investigation to determine the general opinion of whites on the purchase of several farms on the Luvuvhu valley (where blacks were staying) had been conducted with a view to creating a settlement scheme. The proposed scheme included farms such as, Laatgevonden 74 belonging to Gaymans, Barotta 65 belonging to Coetzee, Klein Australia belonging to Venter, Welgevonden 120 belonging to Andendoff, Madrid belonging to Menne and Morgenzon belonging to Louw.\textsuperscript{116} The first three farms, it was argued, fell in an area demarcated as government forest plantation, and no-one therefore could claim to own the streams, provided that the whole of Barotta and Klein Australia had been bought by the state (It was part of the land taken from the Ravele community in the 1920's).\textsuperscript{117} The quality of the soil and the fact that the land could be bought cheaply without the construction of huge dams, compelled the Land Board to recommend to the government to proclaim the area as an irrigation scheme as required by Irrigation Act No. 8 of 1912 as amended.\textsuperscript{118}

The argument was that the proposed scheme, at its initial stages, would affect the people of Ravele at Barotta and Klein Australia and others who settled at Laatgevonden.\textsuperscript{119} It meant that the white owners had title deeds to such areas, which the Africans were denied. Furthermore, “the interest of the public” referred to were those of whites and not Africans, since the scheme was to the benefit of whites and not blacks.\textsuperscript{120} The result was that on 22 December 1935, it was reported that, the government had acquired irrigable, fertile land. E.A. Rooth, a member of Parliament, supported by local farmers was largely responsible for this new settlement scheme, which would provide irrigation for many of the farmers who for years fought a loosing battle at the back of the Zoutpansberg mountain against arid conditions. In addition, reference was made to the productivity of the adjoining settlement known as Welgevonden, a success achieved through government assistance. This was meant to show that, the area was indeed fertile and productive and that the Ravele community who were part of the blacks who occupied the farm were supposed to move.\textsuperscript{121}
The effect of purchasing land in the Luvuvhu valley before the passing of the Native Trust Land Act by the government was intended to manipulate white farmers in the area. This implied that, land in Luvuvhu would be sold at high prices to the farmers, because farmers were made to believe by the government that the soil was more fertile than it actually was. On the other hand, it also made it impossible for individuals (Ravele community and blacks) to reject claims for excision for the purpose of the settlement scheme, because it was imposed on them.  

Towards the end of 1936, before the irrigation construction began, Grimbeeck ascertained that an overwhelming majority of white settlers behind the mountain were no longer willing to move. Out of 215 holdings, only five people assured the authorities that they were ready to take up holdings in the fertile spots of the valley, 181 indicated that they were not willing to go to the Luvuvhu valley and the remaining 29 were not available at that time of the survey, but it was assumed that they were also against the move to the Luvuvhu valley. This contradicted what was reported while the settlement was at its initial stage. The government on the other hand, adopted a neutral position as far as the relocations were concerned, arguing that settlers were not being pressurised to move but had to do so voluntarily. Settlers, such as, Le Roux, Cloete, Mulder, Badenhorst and Vogels were the first to take advantage of the scheme.

The government did not develop Luvuvhu valley into white settlement before 1936, because it was malarious and substantial funds were needed in the health sector, for the prevention of malaria. In the 1930's, the area was opened to whites. It was not recorded whether settlers from the north were reluctant to move to Luvuvhu because of malaria, however before they moved in, Dr Annecke of Tzaneen, was sent to make recommendations about housing and the prevention of malaria in Levubu. The recommendations were that, every precaution had to be taken so that people would stay as healthy as possible, to prevent an outbreak of an epidemic. According to Dr Annecke all houses should be adequately gazed, and reliable insecticides such as Pyagra should be used daily. Bed nets, repellent smears such as citronella oil should also be used. Houses should also be mosquito proof. Annecke also recommended that the housing that were constructed for the irrigation engineer should be demolished as it was not up to standard and that he should be involved at each and every step of development of the
The Department of Health also embarked on a large scale training and educating programmes and distributed pamphlets to farmers in the area. This was done to raise the level of awareness against the disease; and to teach them how to use dangerous insecticides. A resident nurse was also stationed at the settlement. While the government was channelling the funds to make settlers as healthy as possible, it was reported on the other hand that, natives in the Transvaal were dying like flies due to malaria. This was because the government did not extend its programme of malaria prevention to blacks. This indicates that Africans were discriminated against even in matters of life and death. In conclusion one can say that the arrival of white settlers and improvements made in the Luvuvhu valley led to the relocation of the Ravele community.

3.4 THE REMOVAL OF THE RAVELE COMMUNITY (1921-1940)

3.4.1 Initial removal (1921-1925)

The 1921 removal was for forestry purposes and was in accordance with the Forestry Act, 1913, Land Settlement Act, 1912 and 1913 Land Act. This first forced removal in the Luvuvhu valley took place during the reign of Khosi Vele Ravele, who passed away in 1924. In this instance, the Ravele community was moved from one farm to another within the same Luvuvhu valley.

As a result of pressure, Chief Ravele moved from one part of the farm at Tshingani to Klein Australie (Solomela/Sudimela). Other chiefs moved to other areas, like the Sibasa area and Hamashau area.

No government assistance was given to these people to move. People moved at different times because, it became so unbearable to live on the farms. Some of those remaining people became labourers on the farm but unfortunately they were later again evicted out of Klein Australie portion in 1921. With these removals, most of the people were moved from the northern part of the farm to the
homestead of headman Mukhathedzwa. Some of the people who remained behind were forced to engage as forestry workers on the bluegum and pine forestry plantations.132
3.4.2 Later removal (1936-1940)

In 1936, the Lands Department purchased the farms in the Luvuvhu area, with the purpose of forming a European Irrigation Settlement. This latest removal brought about the total removal of the Ravele community, together with other blacks from the Luvuvhu valley. They were destined for different areas chosen for them by the government. Luvuvhu valley became white settlement after this final removal.133

Though a certificate had been furnished by the Minister of Lands, as required by the Act, to show that this vast expanse of land was crown land and was necessary for European settlement, other land of equal agricultural value had still to be found. The committee responsible for white settlement regarded “New Mauluma” in the Nzhelele valley as land of equal agricultural value to the Luvuvhu valley. The Ravele’s and other blacks from the Luvuvhu area purchased by the government, were supposed to move to “New Mauluma” and other areas.134

Some members of the Ravele community felt that such a move was a betrayal, others wanted to pressurise the government to be included in its irrigation scheme. They wanted to be treated the same as white settlers. If the interest of the Luvuvhu community were respected, they should have been permitted to stay and be part of the irrigation scheme. Race played a very important role, in determining who should remain or be removed.135

According to a letter to a member of parliament, E.A. Rooth; the Luvuvhu scheme was ready for occupation by the new settlers in July 1937.136 Thus the removal of the Ravele’s from Luvuvhu was fixed to take place at the end of August 1937.137 W.A. Bidell, assistant Native Commissioner at Sibasa indicated that some of these blacks would be used as labourers when irrigable plots were ready and some would be accommodated in his district, Zoutpansberg.138 Most of them could be absorbed as labourers, especially at Drifontein, which was developing citrus plantations.139
In the meantime (September 1937) the Department of Lands decided not to press for the immediate eviction of the black occupants in the Luvuvhu valley. Those who were on the land were permitted to remain there until further notice. For their stay, the government demanded that they pay rent to the Department of Lands, as well as grazing fee for their stock and also give service as labourers on the white farms. This was done by the government, to solve some of the labour problems on the white farms. The rent was determined at the rate of the ordinary crown rent payable in that area. This meant the little they had was taken away leading to more frustration in the community.\textsuperscript{140}

It was determined that there were approximately 800 black taxpayers who were liable for the payment of rent and grazing fees on the Luvuvhu irrigation settlement amounting to an estimated amount of, £1500 to £1800. The Additional Native Commissioner, Louis Trichardt, was requested to undertake the collections and it was reported that an amount of £285 was collected during an administrative visit to the farm Madrid during February 1937. This system drained the Ravele community and others in the Luvuvhu valley economically. Many were forced to curb and to sell their animals in order to pay the rent. Others decided to become labourers in nearby white farms. A certain portion of the community decided to leave the Luvuvhu valley, in protest against the introduced rent.\textsuperscript{141}

It was estimated that some 13,000 souls, who possessed 1348 head of small stock and 1840 heads of large stock would be affected. There were also six “Induna” magotas on the properties affected. But it was reported that, it was not yet possible to find suitable accommodation for these people.\textsuperscript{142}

By March 1938 it was estimated that, provision elsewhere for some 800 families had to be made.\textsuperscript{143} These were 300 Vhavenda families falling under Induna Ravele (one of chief Mphephu’s headmen) and 500 Shangaan families falling under four Indunas, namely Shigalo, with about 150 families, Masakona, with about 250 families and Ngwandhla and Gwangkoti, each with about 50 families.\textsuperscript{144} It was thought that the number of Ravele subjects would possibly be reduced as other morgen of the settlement area was to be taken over by the Forestry Department which was anxious to retain as many families as possible on the grounds.\textsuperscript{145} However, the number of families to be removed was high, because only a
few families were willing to work as labour tenants on white farms. This indicated one form of resistance that Ravele could make, as there were no other means to show their dissatisfaction. It also indicated that they regarded themselves as a community, hence their to be subordinates to white settlers (although later conditions forced them to do so) refusal.  

Sometimes when various reasons failed to lure people to their designated place, silent means was used. On 22 August 1938 it was reported that the removal of the Vhavenda (including the Ravele) in the Luvuvhu valley was already in progress. The Forestry Department absorbed some of the Ravele’s, others were moved to the dry, stoney Beaconsfield and Cliffside. The remaining blacks would be moved to Diepkloof as soon as this farm had been purchased and taken over by the Trust.

On 6 September 1938, headmen Shigalo and Masakona, who were living in the Luvuvhu valley, together with the Ravele community, were informed that, Magor, Caledon and Wagondrift cannot be made available for their settlement. They were moved out of the fertile Luvuvhu valley to a barren land in the Pietersburg district: Nieuwland No. 81, Koedoesfontein No. 46, Soetfontein No. 153 and only if necessary Bandoliersfontein No. 154 in the Duivelskloof area. The Ravele community was re-settled in the other direction without any Sotho’s or Shangaans. This means, these people were moved to places allocated along the ethnic lines resulting in ethnic divisions.

They were moved in groups. During Tshivhase reign, on 12 September 1938, one group of the Ravele entity was forcibly removed and dumped on the barren Beaconsfield group of farms. They occupied Beaconsfield 212 MT, Diepkloof 211MT, Cliffside 225MT, Baobab 210MT, Mapela 205MT and Setoni. In this place, Mauluma ward was re-established as part of Mphephu’s domain. They now again, for the first time since 1898, had political and administrative control over land (even though barren).

On 17 October 1938, another group of 39 Ravele families was settled on the farm Beaconsfield and 14 families on Cliffside and Baobab. Those who had been placed on to Beaconsfield owned 104 head of large stock and small stock. Those on Cliffside and Baobab owned 47 large and 48 small stock. Hut
poles had been provided for huts building. The above group, was part of the Luvuvhu valley inhabitants who were affected by the irrigation scheme. Once the settlement had been accomplished the next question was whether their stock, which played an essential part of their livelihood, would survive in their relocated areas. The government had not take that into consideration.\textsuperscript{151}

However Phillips, an executive member of the Farmer’s Union, claimed that the Native Affairs Department had provided good houses for the dispossessed blacks from Madrid and Barotta. As a member of the Farmers Union, Phillips might have exaggerated the claims to convince politicians like Rheinalt Jones that the displaced blacks had been taken good care of. However, Philips did not mention in his letter pertinent issues, such as the conditions of soil and water. He might have been afraid that Rheinalt Jones would fight for those basic necessities and, if those were acquired by the blacks, it might restrict the flow of labour to white farmers. In 1939 Entabeni and Barotta No. 65 were declared government plantation areas in compliance with section 5 of the Forest Act of 1913 as amended. This meant that the people of Matidza, Makatu and Ravele and Ratombo would be moved. This was aggravated by the application of chapter 4 of the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936, which was firmly implemented in April 1939. Application of Chapter 4 could led to an exodus of blacks from Levubu farms like in Lydenburg district (where 180 days of labour was required as rent). Levubu farmers decided that tenants should perform 90 days labour as rent tenants.\textsuperscript{152}

Not all of the families of the Ravele entity, were re-settled in 1938. The Department of Forestry absorbed some as wage labourers, labour tenants and rent paying tenants to the new owners or white farmers. The ruling Ravele family also did not move. Acting Nduna Tshivhase (called Jack Godane in the correspondence), tribal Makhadzi (late Ravele’s sister), Tshivhase’s mother, two wives, Aunt, two widows of the deceased Nduna Nanga Ravele, Nanga’s mother, Frank Nndwakhulu Ravele (the son and heir of the late Nduna Nanga Ravele, who passed away in 1937), stayed in the village.\textsuperscript{153}

The village was situated on the forestry portion, on the farm Barotta 17LT. At that time, the officials, understood that, the members of the ruling family would only stay until the body of the deceased Nanga had decomposed, so that they could take his skeletal remains with them to Beaconsfield 212MT. They
were even allowed to stay, near the graves, to tend them and perform the annual propitiatory rites there.\textsuperscript{154}

The Ravele royal family were therefore, granted permission to stay with effect from 23 November 1938 for a five year period, which they could extend on a year to year basis, until the custodians were able to leave. They were allowed to have small ploughing fields around their huts though frustratingly they were not allowed to start fires and cut trees.\textsuperscript{155}

It was only in the late 1930's, when the portion of the farm where the village was situated, was to be afforested. During that time, the officials learned that it was not in keeping with the Ravele’s custom to remove the remains of a deceased. They were in fact, guarding the graveyard.\textsuperscript{156} The Department of Forestry, then gave assurances that, the graves would be left undisturbed, as the land the graves occupied would not be required for afforestation.\textsuperscript{157} Dommise then arranged for the members of the royal family to be removed to the adjacent farm Klein Australie 13LT and to continue as custodians of the graves. This was the only land available in the vicinity of these graves for the royal family which would not be required for afforestation purposes. They were then removed out of the farm to Beaconsfield.\textsuperscript{158}

\subsection*{3.5 SIGNIFICANCE}

This chapter has attempted to show how Levubu as a white settlement area came about. In the process, it exposed the type of assistance that the government gave the settlements.\textsuperscript{159} On the other hand, white settlement in the area meant that the Africans who were living there had to be removed and resettled in arid and mountainous areas without assistance at all.\textsuperscript{160} In these areas the Ravele community and other blacks removed suffered impoverishment. In the next chapter attention will be given to those removed and how they made a living under conditions of extreme hardship.\textsuperscript{161}
CHAPTER 4

CONSEQUENCES OF THE FORCED REMOVAL

The establishment of a white Luvuvhu settlement in the Luvuvhu valley, had a profound effect on both the (whites) beneficiaries of resettlement and the Ravele community that bore the brunt of this experiment. It is not an easy task for one to categorise the significance of the forced removals, as they did not occur in isolation. These consequences however, influenced each other.

Poverty is the main theme, in this chapter, as it was the single most devastating result of the relocation. Platzky makes the general suggestion in the South African context that “relocation impoverishes the communities and people who are removed,” but such poverty “has many dimensions.” It is not limited only to economic poverty but permeates all spheres of life including a person’s self respect, the harshness of living, a feeling of powerlessness and hopelessness. This chapter seeks to examine how this question on relocation made the Ravele community, economically, socially and politically impoverished. Specific cases will be examined to illustrate the impact of relocation on the Ravele community.

4.1 ECONOMIC

Conditions in the relocated areas were at their very worst. People were struggling to cope with the trauma of the removal, the unfamiliarity of their surrounding and the makeshift quality of the settlement. As suggested by Platzky “both the way in which people are moved and conditions they found themselves in, vary according to who they are. In South Africa, Indians and coloureds got better facilities than Africans, urban more than rural, the employed more than the unemployed, industrial more than agricultural. The Ravele community and other blacks in the Luvuvhu valley, fell within the category of being African, who happened to find themselves doing agricultural work in a rural area declared
In the Luvuvhu valley, the Ravele community were self-employed, involved in agriculture for subsistence purpose, with surpluses exchanged with other members of the community. To show that they were self-sufficient they commented that “Everyone ploughed the field depending on the manpower he has, it was not demarcated how much land one can plough, his abilities and manpower to cultivate determined this. “We worked for three months for the farmer, we ploughed our fields as much as we liked, we never bought “mugayo” (maize meal, the staple food of the Ravele community), beans, ground nuts, a variety of vegetables and water.”

This symbolizes the contrasts between where they were removed and the area where they were resettled. They indicated that people produced enough to eat, and poverty was unknown to them, though some were working for nothing, as noted by Lacey, as they were working for “boroko” (a place to sleep).

The Ravele community was located in the reserve or Trust land, established for residential purpose only, as no agricultural land was allotted. People accustomed to ploughing were likely to suffer, as there were neither ploughing nor grazing fields. It was difficult, for people to survive in such places. They changed from being producers to being dependent on white farmers. It was an attempt by the government to provide cheap labour in order to build wealth for white settlers in Luvuvhu. It was also not out of the Ravele community’s own will, but because they had no choice.

There was the extreme shortage of land in the areas where people were relocated. The effect of the removal on agriculture was to reduce people’s stock holdings, while others lost all their livestock. It also reduced their access to land, thereby reducing the extent and scale of agricultural activity and paving the way for a precarious subsistence. There was however in fat one dominant motive for the
acquisition of white agricultural land in the region – the availability of water. Once it was possible to harness the water of the river, the farmers were able to cultivate the land. The Ravele community made special use of the local water resources. They depended on water for cultivation, drinking, building and pastoral farming. Their removal denied them access to water resources, which was difficult to find at New Mauluma.\textsuperscript{169}

How people managed to survive in a situation of extreme land shortage and poverty was an interesting story. Matumba indicated that, they resorted to ploughing on top of the mountains, as there was no other fertile place. One can only imagine how difficult it was for one to adapt from being accustomed to cultivating flat areas to mountainous areas. Hirson who commented that “he did not know whether the government intended to turn all blacks into monkeys,” also observed ploughing on mountainous areas. Moreover, a land surveyor asserted that “when comparing a native land map with a contour map, native land was either mountainous or too rocky and too high for farming. That was also the case with Mauluma, where the Ravele community was relocated.\textsuperscript{170}

Cattle proved to be a liability rather than an asset to the owners, since they had to pay a 20-cent tax per head for dipping, in order to prevent cattle from dying of tick transmitted diseases. In the Luvuvhu valley, dipping was free. It was the duty of the chief, to provide dipping tank. However, payment was reasonable in the instance as the dipping medicine needed to be purchased. What was unfair, was paying for pasture since this had never been part of their culture. This system of taxation impoverished the community because it was levied on people who did not work and, because of relocation, had become poor. These unfavourable issues coupled with bad living conditions and a R2 tax, known as Tshibalo and paid by every married man per year, forced people to sell their stock. When all the livestock had been sold, the Ravele community was left with no other source of income. They had to seek employment in white areas as migrant labourers.\textsuperscript{171}

4.1.2 Labour
Farm work was another alternative for those Ravele families affected by relocation. White farmers and black farm workers were tied together by an interdepending relationship, which meant the survival of the two. It was always difficult to deal with one and ignore the other.172

The farmers could either daily transport workers by ferrying them to and from home or on Friday and Sundays, hence maximising production and reducing costs, a fundamental feature inherent in a capitalist economy.173 Though cost was reduced, labourers travelled in open trucks in winter and summer. This indicated the situation in which some members of the Ravele community found themselves in.174

Labourers from New Mauluma and other areas toiled from dusk to dawn, nearly 12 hours a day and 72 hours per week. Mrs Mulder, one of those who settled at Luvuvhu valley around 1937, reported that black labour was worth only R2 per month. This indicated how black labour in Luvuvhu valley was valued by white settlers. However, wages varied from farm to farm and according to gender and age.175 Child labour in Luvuvhu valley was common and farmers exploited them as they were regarded as “cheap” and could be treated according to the wishes of the farmers. To make matters worse, some of them usually got their dues 5 days after the salary calendar month had ended and there was no provision for one to question the employer as one might face expulsion, which might lead to loss of accommodation and the little that families were depending on. At times farm labourers were paid in kind. Some employers in Luvuvhu valley were reported as having a tendency of beating up their workers, during month end, so that they would forsake their employment without having received their dues.176 Morrel’s observation of a similar situation elsewhere in the country was equally valid for Luvuvhu. He writes that “in an economy, in which black labour power came cheap, black bodies were the site on which farmers exercised their blood stained power.” As a result, workers rights were violated and that they were forced into marginal existence with poverty affecting every facet of their lives.177

To avoid destitution some members of the Ravele community became migrant workers, but that split the family and caused further stress. “Migrant workers (magaraba) are the ones who can help us, they send us money because they have families here.”178 Usually conditions in relocation areas were so harsh that
a family did not enjoy a sufficient standard of living to maintain good health. Any family or community that was formerly living above minimum level for survival was likely to experience relocation as a debilitating loss.  

Those who went to towns were the only hope for those left in New Mauluma. Migrant workers from the Ravele clan were reported to be as far as Johannesburg and Kimberly. They worked on mines, industries, shops, building construction and road works. Other members of the Ravele community sought employment in urban areas, as there was nothing to depend on, in the relocated areas. Despite the fact that, most of those who went to town provided relief to their starving families in New Mauluma, more harm was done to the families that were left behind. Many families were left without the guidance and protection of the patriarch. Women and children were left on their own, leading to lawlessness in many families.

Relocated communities survived on the payment of both migrant’s remittances and the payment of old age pensions and the Ravele community was no exception. Some households at New Mauluma were fortunate to have pensioners in their family. It was usual to find the whole family living on pensions of elderly grandparents and considering themselves fortunate to have this source of income. In my interview for this research, pension ranked as the most important cash income after formal wage employment (mostly from migrant labourers). Their vital role in supplementing and sometimes substituting wage earnings was most marked in the rural close settlement like Mauluma.

Migrant labourers from New Mauluma were mostly from 16 years to 64 years of age. Mare put it clearly that, “as soon as they become, for some reason or another, no longer fit for work in the labour market, they were expected to return to their country of origin or territory of their national unit.” If one was disabled because of the work he did one was thrown out of the job with little provisions or without provisions. Out of the little which they got, they were forced to pay taxes to the chiefs, as well as school fees, water and dip tax. Those families without a pensioner as a source of income were faced with extreme hardship. When funds dried up either because a migrant worker loses a job or an old age pensioner dies, there was nothing to depend on. Traditionally, the use of land provided a last
lifeline. This was denied to many who had it before they were moved to New Mauluma location. Old age pensions played a very important role as lifebelts and many households were desperate to qualify for this. 186

People in New Mauluma also appeared to depend heavily on an informal network of borrowing and support within the community. “When food is finished we are helped by our neighbours. We also help them sometimes.” The statement above suggest that creating a living was difficult if not impossible in these areas. 187

4.1.3 Other losses

The removal of the Ravele community from Luvuvhu valley resulted in great financial losses, as few received meagre compensation, regardless of the level of the economic losses they had endured as a result of the unplanned resettlement. In the years of relocation, there were no regular public transport services that could be used to carry the people and their belongings to the relocated areas. The old, the sick and the young had to be carried on the back of the strong ones. 188 Other white farmers benefited economically out of the removal, because those who could afford it hired privately owned wagons from the whites of the neighbouring farms. Some privately owned wagons were hired from other Vhavenda’s of Davhana village like Rasengane. The means of payment for such services rendered were cattle. The white farmers charged mostly two cattle per trip - per load, while Rasengane charged one per trip - per load. Through this payment, the Ravele’s were already using the meagre resources which they were supposed to use at barren New Mauluma. 189

Since the Ravele community was relocated to settlements that resembled deserts conditions, it implied that all traditional skills of making household articles came to an end. People were unable to make sleeping mats such as “thovho” made from reeds found in rivers for their economic benefits. Clay, a valuable material for the making of cooking pots was unavailable for the community. As a result, they were forced to buy these articles from other communities, which added to the difficult of the Ravele community with no source of income. 190
4.2 SOCIAL

Given the lack of agricultural land and the dearth of local employment, having migrant workers in the household in most cases made the difference between mere poverty and absolute destitution in New Mauluma. Reliance increased in this period. It was a tendency that persisted up to the 1980’s. Seen against this state of affairs it is noteworthy to be aware of the change in industrial production. Being relocated, adjusted to external centres of monetary rewards and the decline of traditional industry in the Nzhelele valley had fundamental impact in the structural cultural patterns of the Ravele’s.¹⁹¹

The expectations which members of the family had developed such as looking after each other for support, healing and growth disappeared.¹⁹² Those left at home lacked the energy to cope with forming new identities as the situation demanded. This contributed to the destruction of their self-esteem and sense of hopelessness. Poverty was likely to hit hard at families without males, as females were left to assume duties once performed by males at home.¹⁹³

In addition, children in New Mauluma grew up in unhealthy conditions. This contributed to their emotional and mental instability from lack of family care and adequate food needed for growth and development. These effects can be portrayed through the lives of many children in New Mauluma who, since birth, had never known the interior of a classroom. It was not because families were not aware of the possibilities of a bright future if one was educated, but it was simply because these families were unable to provide for the education of their children. For them education was no longer an asset or investment but a liability, since it would drain the little they had for survival.¹⁹⁴

According to Saunders, removal also cut across both the informal education that takes place within the family, and formal schooling. When the family was under stress, separated or split up by migratory labour, it cannot supply direction and assurance to the young. Relocation also broke children’s contact with the significant members of the community, for example its elders who normally set them a pattern and standard of life.¹⁹⁵ Likewise their schooling was upset, especially when the relocation area had no
or only inadequate school facilities. Complaints by other communities that schools promised were not built or that their children were forced to travel long distances, also yielded no results. If the schools were too far from their homes children simply stay away as they were not accustomed to travelling long distances. This led to high rate of illiteracy amongst the Ravele community. Such illiteracy naturally led to poverty, which encouraged criminal activities, such as thieving, which the Luvuvhu white farmers complained about.196

Pertinent here is the question: how did the Ravele community react and respond to the removal or relocation? Many were often simply unable to cope. Aggravated poverty led to fatalism, or to antagonism towards those who still had resources.197 When people were overwhelmed with various stresses, the body’s immunity system breaks down and so their resistance to disease lessens.198 The prevalent sense of anxiety and fear lead people to despair of ever being properly healthy again. Many relocated families did overcome these conditions and survived all these hardships but, that were due to families’ own resilience and community support, and not because of the government support.199

The anger and frustration of the community was not unleashed against the often appalling conditions but turned inwards (i.e personally and in the community). The grievances of the households were directed against their neighbours or against other newcomers engaged in the competition for scarce resources. “I am only a woman” said one woman interviewed at New Mauluma after relocation, in reply to the question “What do you intend to do about your problems?” Her attitude was echoed by another person in the community “we can’t do anything about it. Initially, people were even talking about going back, but nobody talks like that today”. This means, people have adapted to the hardships. As one added, “We expect the government to help us, because we cannot do anything without their intervention, for they brought us here.”200 One of the consequences of this helplessness was the deeply engrained pessimism that I encountered in New Mauluma. This could be seen both as a source of strength (people did manage to cope and adapt) and as a sources of weakness (people accepted the unacceptable and get used to hardship).201

A further threat to the Ravele community in the relocation area was their lack of protection and security.
People who did not fall under the Ravele community were grouped together within Ravele’s. These had no commonly recognised authority, as their elders that could deal effectively with their disputes and problems, could not act on behalf of the members of communities relocated within them. As a result, any sense of authority and direction was lost, and so violence and anti-social behaviour erupted. These were “modern” strategies for dealing with community’s problems.

George Ellis, in his paper, “dimension of poverty”, argued that communities can suffer severe deprivation of the means that prevents them from carrying out their usual cultural activities. This is what he calls “cultural poverty”. This cultural poverty in the case of the Raveles, cannot be divorced from the fact that, they had experienced severe land shortage due to the removals. The survival of any culture depends on the resources garnered from the land. For example, “murundu” need to be performed in the bush hence it was difficult for the Ravele community to do this, because New Mauluma was like a desert. The Ravele community have strong cultural attachments to their ancestors as is shown by their respect for the graves in which the Ravele’s were buried in various areas in Luvuvhu valley and elsewhere. They relied on these graves for their spiritual fulfilment. The establishment of farms around these graves meant that the Vhavenda were denied access to them by the white farmers, though some like the Ravele community were initially allowed to visit them, but were later denied access to them and were labelled “trespassers” if caught visiting such places. The Ravele’s experienced also what Ellis called “psychological poverty” or “spiritual poverty” because they were denied access to worship their ancestors. The royal families were also denied the benefits associated with the thevhula rituals, which were performed in royal graves.

In order to compensate for their spiritual needs, since it was impossible to perform traditional ancentral rituals, some Ravele’s, like other Venda’s, turned to Christianity. Christianity suppressed and forbade their traditional ways of worshipping. Many Ravele’s turned to it, because it offered them advantages like schooling and an opportunity to be accepted in the whiteman’s world. An opportunity to get educated encouraged the Ravele’s to look down upon their culture. Education meant moulding them for the benefit of white settlers and at the same time, it also prepared them for a better future. The implication was that they were made to believe and to measure their standard of living through the
whiteman’s eyes, which was not necessarily the right criterion. What is good for whites may be bad for blacks. For example, performing rites was regarded as evil by whites, while in the Ravele community this ensures power and prosperity.

The Ravele community was also denied the right to perform the “murundu” or boys circumcision, because the suitable sites for such activities were located on the farms, while the relocated area made it impossible for them to perform circumcision due to lack of forests and water. “Murundu”, is a ritual which almost all Vhavenda boys have to go through. This is an “experience and right of passage” which was missed by this boys. After the removal, the Native Commissioner, became the one who recommended, a person to perform the operation. This means the powers of some members of the community, for example those who run these schools, were usurped by the Native Affairs Commissioner. The diminishing status of these schools can be attributed directly to the involvement of whites in cultural practices they knew nothing about.

Though these are some of the reactions of the Ravele community who were moved it should not be concluded that these responses were uniform. The Ravele community were coloured by the experiences people brought with them from their previous situations. Some of the people who have moved off white farms were sometimes relieved to have escaped oppressive conditions there. As one stated : “This is a place under blacks and the last place is a farm under a white farmer, who does not take blacks as people but as tools to make him rich.” Other farm workers showed a more ambivalent attitude towards their relocation : “It is better here because we are not under the rule of white farmers. But the poverty then was not like it is now. Before, I had land to farm and enough livestock.” For those who had never had a house before, a site in a relocation area represented a security, previously unknown : “We no longer stay as lodgers, we are no longer under threat of being evicted.”

In conclusion, one may argue that the process of relocation caused impoverishment in the Ravele community. They were removed from fertile Luvuvhu valley to a barren, rocky New Mauluma in the Nzhelele valley. This made them dependent on old age pensions, migrant - labour earnings and employment on white farms in the valley. Some white settlers and blacks benefited temporarily out of relocation. They were hired by some blacks to carry luggage to New Mauluma. Relocation to other
members of the Ravele community meant ownership of land, to others it meant impoverishment.
4.3 POLITICAL

It is difficult to separate Venda culture and its politics because the lives (of the chief and subjects), power, stability in the community, prosperity depended on performing certain rites. For example “thevhula” was meant for stability and prosperity. But relocation affected rites which had resulted in unstability and poverty. The political results of the relocation of people in South Africa in general and the Vhavenda in particular, since the enactment of the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936, are still rippling through the veins of the politics of South Africa. One finds that by the time of the outbreak of World War II in 1939, the outline of the land on which the subsequent Bantustan policy of the nationalist government would be developed had already been established. The areas that had been set aside as reserves were creations from a process of conquest and colonisation. They were established to serve white interest. They amounted to a fraction of what once had been traditional African land. They were in no way the sum total of those traditional lands, as apologists for the bantustans would later try to claim.²¹¹

The declining yields and growing landlessness of people in the reserves threatened both the political stability of those areas and formed the basis of the migrant labour system itself. People who were no longer able to make any living at all from the land were driven permanently to urban areas, where they could try to find jobs. The new trend of movement alarmed the government planners.²¹² But instead of allowing people to move off the land or vastly increasing the amount of land available to them - both of which would have amounted to a major restructuring of policy, they tried to stretch the already inadequate and exhausted reserves to accommodate even more people. The tenacious attachment of rural blacks to land was not simply a psychological or sociological phenomenon, it was a matter of basic economics and power. This issue was totally ignored by the government in its development of the policy of closer settlement, as a substitute for urbanisation.²¹³
The Ravele community and other blacks in Luvuvhu valley were removed, mostly because they were blacks. The government wanted the valley to be occupied by white settlers. To them, blacks should not be given more land, since they were unproductive. Opposition to this attitude was also based on the fact that such irrigable land was suitable for white settlers and replaced by dry lands, since “natives do not make use of irrigation.” This contradicted the observation made by Stayt that “there was enough water for irrigation, crops were grown throughout the year by the Vhavenda’s, whom the Ravele’s were a part of”. One may argue that, the desire to disposses the Ravele’s of their fertile land was a strong desire of the government. Land meant a lot amongst the blacks (including the Ravele’s), to them it meant power and livelihood. The loss of land (Luvuvhu valley) meant, erosion of their social, economic and political power.

The experience of relocation confirmed in many blacks, the belief that they cannot exercise any control over their lives or the lives of their families. The dominant mood in relocation areas was often one of passivity and helplessness in the face of the enormous problems that confront the people. To organise themselves to fight removal was generally (although not always) chaotic, particularly in the most isolated areas like New Mauluma. The Ravele community was afraid to be crushed by white government. Relocation can thus be seen as a process of disorganisation as well as dispossession.

Removals uprooted families and destroyed homes. The forced removals ordered by the State showed no concern for the problems of family life, nor did they respect the delicacy of its structures. According to Platzy, a family is a group of people whose behaviour is loosely interrelated. Forced removal, however, profoundly attacked and undermined the delicate balance of family life. They serve the continuities a family has built up, and offered few prospects for its further growth. If a family migrates voluntarily, having weighed up the prospective gains as greater than its losses, this usually gives it an enhanced sense of self-worth. People who choose to move were seeking an improved situation and so would have the energy to cope with forming a new identity as the situation demands. According to Matumba this was lacking with the Ravele forced removal. The government frequently induced hopelessness and damaged the Ravele’s self esteem both personally and within the family unit. The
Ravel’s felt threatened, powerless and unable to cope with their bewildering predicament. The fact of being coerced into moving aggravated this damage.\textsuperscript{218}

The removal, broke the authority of the patriarch. Many rural families were fairly traditional, having a close relationship to their land, a family life that extends to many relatives and patriarchal authority. For the traditional family the land was the habitat of the ancestors, the place where they were looked after. For example the refusal of the Ravel royal kraal to move out of Barotta. It is the duty of the patriarch to look after these spiritual sites.\textsuperscript{219}

Traditional authority, vested in older males was also broken. For example, the father to whom everyone looks may be shattered by his powerlessness, his loss of work and inability to provide for his family. If he became a migrant worker, this would be the same for the family, as they would be losing its head. As I have indicated under economic consequences, the children particularly the boys; grew up without a male on whom to model themselves. As man enters the migratory labour system, a step forced on him by relocation, new responsibilities are thrust on the women at home. As a result, the migratory system broke many family structures, as many heads of family stayed in the urban areas.\textsuperscript{220}

The government knew very well that, blacks were poor but efficient due to their rich ecological environment and therefore will not serve their needs unless they were stripped of their sources of living.\textsuperscript{221} This is demonstrated by the Ravel community and other blacks in the Luvuvhu valley, who were all self-sufficient before their departure.\textsuperscript{222}

There were tribal wars, amongst Venda’s, Vatsonga’s and Northern Sotho’s, for power and land mostly in winter. But these groups were not concerned if their immediate chief or headman belonged to another tribe since they were at liberty to approach a chief of their own tribe with their problems. Vhavenda’s had their own initiation schools but the Vatsongas were perfectly free not to attend them. Relocation, removed and settled these communities according to their ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{223} As a result, trust villages, regrouped on ethnic lines were scattered throughout the Zoutpansberg region. For example, the Ravel community was moved out of the Luvuvhu valley to Beaconsfield group of farms, meant for
Vhavenda speaking people only. These ethnic locations, have left a legacy in the psyche of those involved because people now tend to identify themselves according to such differences. The mentality of “us” and “them” is evident in their everyday life. Such mentality is dangerous and it threatens to destroy our society. If something unfortunate happens, like the removal from the valley, Shangaans blamed Vhavenda’s for the removals, while the Vhavenda’s blamed the Shangaans for accepting relocation.224

In conclusion, one may argue that the power of the patriarch; chief was eroded. Children and women now played most crucial roles in the relocated area. As a result this affected family values. However, one of the most significant contributions that the process brought was to increase enmity, based on ethnic differences, between the Shangaans, Northern Sotho’s and the Vhavenda’s. These differences were most desirable for the government as it furthered its objectives of achieving its policy of divide and rule, as these groups concentrated on fighting each other instead of fighting the whites or the oppressors.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to highlight some of the key processes in the making of Luvuvhu valley a white settlement. Before the valley belonged to the Vhavenda (the Ravele community), Shangaans and the Pedi’s. Such alienation started after the reign of Makhado in 1865, who strongly resisted land encroachment, by controlling the hunting grounds. Alienation became evident during the reign of Mphephu in 1895 resulting in his defeat in 1899 by the South African Republic.\textsuperscript{225}

The 1913 Land Act led to the setting up of the 1917 Land Commission and the removal of the Ravele community. The evidence given before the National Land Committee in 1917 showed that the Ravele and others in the valley were paying rent to absentee landlords. They were able to make a living without working for whites. White farmers in the area, recommended to the commission that, such fertile lands should be taken away from the Ravele community ensuring that blacks were dependant on white settlers.\textsuperscript{226}

In 1920's the Ravele community together with others, in the valley were affected by the irrigation scheme. They were removed by the government to the other part of Luvuvhu valley; not designed for irrigation nor plantation scheme. In 1936 the land was declared a white area for purpose of resettling poor white farmers, from the north affected by drought, and for irrigation purposes. Tribal wars amongst the Vhavenda’s made it easy for the government to remove the Ravele community and others in the valley.\textsuperscript{227}
The Ravele community was removed from the land they had lived on for many decades. They were resettled in a rocky place on the Beaconsfield groups of farms in the Nzhelele valley. Some of the displaced were forced to labour on the farms for meagre salaries. This was to the benefit of farmers who used and disposed of these black labourers when they were no longer productive.\textsuperscript{228}

The Ravele community was removed to New Mauluma in the Nzhelele valley, designed to serve as relocation points for surplus population, created by changes in capitalist strategies. The rest of the black population were to serve white controlled economic interests. The government explained to the Ravele community why they were being removed, but it did not explain how they were going to make a living in a rocky area like New Mauluma. This could only be explained in terms of capitalistic interests, where those with power exploited the powerless for their own benefits, irrespective of the harm such exploiters did.\textsuperscript{229}

In front of the authority, the Ravele’s didn’t openly contest the terms of their subordination. But among themselves, the repressed speech about the terms of subordination comes out and Nemutanzhela call this a “hidden transcript.” According to Nemutanzhela, charismatic figures are those with the personal courage to speak the hidden transcript in the face of power. Seen in this light, the Ravele community created a hidden transcript out of its experience of removal and land shortage. The effects of removal were mainly spoken behind the backs of agricultural officers.\textsuperscript{230}

White settlement was regarded a success in terms of the role it played in the economy of the Zoutpansberg. White settlers brought along new farming techniques together with advanced farming implements. This made Luvuvhu to be counted amongst the best producers, especially, of bananas. The settlement in Luvuvhu created many job opportunities for the Ravele community and other blacks from nearby locations. The new jobs on the farms, (to some), made it easier for them to find jobs near homes, instead of being recruited to far away mines. Instead of being migrant labourers, they were able to go home every week if they so wished.\textsuperscript{231}

White settlement in the valley, succeeded in eradicating the poor white problems. On the other hand, it
impoverished viable communities (including the Ravele’s) due to the ir removal from the Luvuvhu valley. This unfortunate situation was probable why the song “We plough because we want food” was sung behind the backs of agricultural officers on many occasions. It forced the Ravele’s to work under brutal conditions on white settlers farms, for example members of the Ravele community were forced to abandon their culture and travel long distances as migrant labourers in order to get higher salaries unlike on farms. All the alternatives for survival they have, did more harm than good for them. The uses to which Luvuvhu land was placed, such as forestry and irrigation shows the priority of the government in controlling means of production. The coming of white settlers, forced the government to pay more attention to an area that was previously ignored, investing a lot of money to support the white farmers in the Luvuvhu valley.232

The volume of the investment clearly indicates that it is not going to be easy for the government to solve land restitution problem in the valley. The Ravele community, the government and the white farmers want to gain out of the Luvuvhu valley land restitution. So the question is: Who is going to win the battle, the government or the Ravele community or white farmers or both. I sincerely hope and wish that at the end justice will prevail.
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